UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,577	04/26/2001	Robert James Lawson	13DV13821	7443

29399 7590 05/04/2005

JOHN S. BEULICK
C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
SUITE 2600
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER	
PHAM, HUNG Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/842,577	LAWSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG Q. PHAM	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 February 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/03/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicants' argument with respect to the rejection of Claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph is respectfully traverses because the referenced paragraphs [0042] and [0043] are not the written description of Claims 1 and 5.

As recited in Claims 1 and 5:

> ***if the user is denied access, prompting the user to complete a request for quick approval wherein the request for quick approval is subjected to an internal exception access process, and quick approval is approved based on pre-established criteria;***
>
> ***retrieving from the centralized database, an exception access rule including pre-established criteria;***
>
> ***applying the exception access rule to the completed request for quick approval; and***
>
> ***automatically approving access based on the exception access rule.***

Paragraph [0043], as referenced by applicants, describes an access process after logging onto UPMS 10 by a user. Exception Access Rules 266 is used for evaluating. However, the written description of paragraph [0043] is for logging, not for the above-recited limitations, e.g., ***if the user is denied access, prompting the user to complete a request for quick approval wherein the request for quick approval is subjected to an internal exception access process ... applying the exception access rule to the completed request for quick approval.*** Paragraph [0042] is the details of requesting for quick approval if the user is denied access. However, there is no description of ***retrieving from the centralized database, an***

exception access rule including pre-established criteria; applying the exception access rule to the completed request for quick approval; and automatically approving access based on the exception access rule are not supported by the specification after the access is denied. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, is maintained.

- Applicants' request of withdrawing the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C § 101 is respectfully declined because of the following reasons:

As set forth in MPEP 2106 (IV) (B) (1), and 2106 (IV) (B) (1) (a):

> *When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make it statutory.*
>
> ...
>
> *Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.*

Claim 16 is directed to ***a computer-implemented database***, a collection of information in a data structure, e.g., a file, but not claimed as embodied in computer readable media. Specifically, the claimed ***computer-implemented database*** comprises only nonfunctional descriptive materials, e.g., ***pre-established criteria***, ***application data***, ***user data***, ***pre-determined rules and methodologies data***. Therefore, Claim 16 is not statutory.

- As argued by applicants at pages 9-11 with respect to the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C § 103:

> *neither Kraenzel nor Behera, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method that includes prompting the user to complete a request for quick approval, retrieving, from the centralized database, an exception access rule including pre-established criteria, applying the exception access rule to the completed request for quick approval, automatically approving access based on the exception access rule.*

Examiner respectfully traverses because of the following reasons:

As shown in FIG. 3 of Kraenzel, *if the user is denied access* indicating by NO branch of box 156, box 162 determines if the user has requested for additional privileges, a YES and NO requests *prompting the user to select* is implied at this box. Instead of granting access as indicated at boxes 152-156, *an internal exception access process* is implemented at boxed 162-166 *for quick approval*. Additional privileges, e.g., read-only, manager... is determined at box 166, and if privileges are granted, ACL is updated at box 168 (Col. 3, Lines 10-11, Col. 4, Lines 20-43). As shown in FIG. 2 is the process of updating ACL. User privileges are determined at box 108, and user's affinity is determined at box 110 by *applying* inferencing rules or *exception access rule* with *pre-established criteria* (FIG. 2, Col.

3, Lines 58-65 and 15-27, Col. 4, Lines 11-13). Kraenzel further discloses objects are stored in the database and can be searched by at least one field (Col. 2, Lines 54-56). A series of inferencing rules is used to determine user's affinity by user affinity determining object (Col. 3, Lines 61-62 and 15-27), then profile system 14 enable the user to activate one or more inferencing rules as desired (Col. 4, Lines 11-13). As seen, an inferencing rule as *an exception access rule including pre-established criteria* in user affinity determining object is *retrieved from the* database as *centralized database* by searching. After updating ACL, the access is *automatically approved based on the* inferencing rules or *exception access rule* (FIG. 3, boxes 156-158, Col. 4, Lines 25-27).

Claims 2-4 are also rejected with the reasons as discussed above.

- As argued by applicants at page 18 with respect to the rejection of Claim 5-15 under 35 U.S.C § 103:

> *Specifically, Kraenzel does not describe nor suggest a method that includes tracking a status of the request using a tracking component coupled to the centralized interactive database, nor if the request for data access is approved, adding at least one of a rule and the user to the database. Moreover, Kraenzel does not describe nor suggest a method that includes if the user is denied access to the requested data, prompting the user to complete a request for quick approval, retrieving, from the centralized database, an exception access rule including pre-established criteria, applying the exception access rule to the completed request for quick approval, and automatically approving access based on the exception access rule.*

Examiner respectfully traverses because of the following reasons:

As illustrated at Kraenzel FIG. 3, after making a request access at box 152, *a status of the request*, either YES for retrieving object at box 158 or NO for requesting

additional privileges at box 162 (Col. 4, Lines 20-35), *is tracked by* Access Determining Object 24 (Col. 3, Lines 5-7) as *a tracking component* included in Profile System 14, and Access Determining Object 24 is *coupled to* an ACL as *centralized interactive database* (Col. 2, Lines 14-16).

If the request for data access is approved at box 166, ACL is updated at box 168 (FIG. 3). The update process is illustrated at Col. 3, Line 58-Col. 4, Lines 1 with inferencing rules or and a profile for the user. In short, the ACL update process performs the claimed *if the request for data access is approved, adding at least one of a rule and the user to the database.*

Referring back to Kraenzel FIG. 3, user privilege is determined again at box 156, *if the user is denied access* indicating by NO branch of box 156, box 162 determines if the user has requested for additional privileges, a YES and NO requests *prompting the user to complete the request for quick approval* is implied at this box. Additional privileges, e.g., read-only, manager... is determined at box 166, and if privileges are granted, ACL is updated at box 168 (Col. 3, Lines 10-11, Col. 4, Lines 20-43). As shown in FIG. 2 is the process of updating ACL. User privileges are determined at box 108, and user's affinity is determined at box 110 by *applying* inferencing rules or *exception access rule* with *pre-established criteria* (FIG. 2, Col. 3, Lines 58-65 and 15-27, Col. 4, Lines 11-13). Kraenzel further discloses objects are stored in the database and can be searched by at least one field (Col. 2, Lines 54-56). A series of inferencing rules is used to determine user's affinity by user affinity determining object (Col. 3, Lines 61-62 and 15-27), then profile system 14 enable the user to activate one or more inferencing rules as desired (Col. 4,

Lines 11-13). As seen, an inferencing rule as *an exception access rule including pre-established criteria* in user affinity determining object is *retrieved from the* database as *centralized database* by searching. After updating ACL, the access is *automatically approved based on the* inferencing rules or *exception access rule* (FIG. 3, boxes 156-158, Col. 4, Lines 25-27).

Claims 2-15 are also rejected with the reasons as discussed above.

- Applicants' arguments at page 23 with respect to the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C § 103 is respectfully traverses because Behera discloses the ACL rules that comprises a group based access guidelines based on the attributes to set up the rule (Behera, Col. 4, lines 42-44) as ***pre-established criteria data developed from access rules and criteria including at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines; applications data including system administrator defined attributes that cross-references the applications profile data against unique identifiers; user data that includes a user's organization and citizenship that cross-references the users profile data against unique identifiers*** (Col. 4, Lines 40-41). Kraenzel teaches ***predetermined rules and methodologies data that facilitates accurate user access-decision making*** (Kraenzel, Col. 2, Lines 12-26).

- In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Kraenzel and Behera teaching are Access Control List, and a missing in Kraenzel technique could be supported by Behera teaching.

- In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: ***the database*** in the step of adding at least one of a rule, and ***the centralized database*** in the step of retrieving. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As in claims 1 and 5, the claimed ***retrieving from the centralized database, an exception access rule including pre-established criteria; applying the exception access rule to the completed request for quick approval; and automatically approving access based on the exception access rule*** if the user is denied access are not supported by the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As set forth in MPEP 2106 (IV) (B) (1), and 2106 (IV) (B) (1) (a):

> *When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make it statutory.*
>
> ...
>
> *Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.*

Claim 16 is directed to ***a computer-implemented database***, a collection of information in a data structure, e.g., a file, but not claimed as embodied in computer readable media. Specifically, the claimed ***computer-implemented database*** comprises only nonfunctional descriptive materials, e.g., ***pre-established criteria***, ***application data***, ***user data***, ***pre-determined rules and methodologies data***. Therefore, Claim 16 is not statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879].

Regarding claim 1, Kraenzel teaches ***a method for providing access to users based on user profiles*** (Kraenzel, Abstract) ***and using a web-based system that includes a server system coupled to a centralized interactive database and at least one client system*** (Col. 1, Lines 13-26, ACL is a centralized interactive database coupled with server/client system).

As shown in FIG. 1, a profile compiling/updating object 32 may use the information received from user affinity determining object 30 to generate a user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 2, Lines 65-67) as the step of ***creating an electronic profile for a user within a***

centralized database, and ***creating*** a list of object, e.g., files, documents..., as ***an electronic profile for data within*** ACL as ***the centralized database*** (Kraenzel, Col. 2, Lines 12-15).

As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 20-31). As seen, the procedure for accessing a requested object as discussed indicates ***methodology is established for user access***.

In order to grant access to a requested object or ***making a decision with reference to the user access***, access privileges in ACL and user profile are compared, and the procedure is processed as at step 156-158 to ***complete an evaluation based on the electronic profiles, and operating methodology in response to a request from the user for access*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 25-31).

Referring back to FIG. 3, ***if the user is denied access*** indicating by NO branch of box 156, box 162 determines if the user has requested for additional privileges, a YES and NO requests ***prompting the user to complete*** is implied at this box. Instead of granting access as indicated at boxes 152-156, ***an internal exception access process*** is implemented at boxed 162-166 ***for quick approval***.

Additional privileges, e.g., read-only, manager... is determined at box 166, and if privileges are granted, ACL is updated at box 168 (Col. 3, Lines 10-11, Col. 4, Lines 20-

43). As shown in FIG. 2 is the process of updating ACL. User privileges are determined at box 108, and user's affinity is determined at box 110 by ***applying*** inferencing rules or ***exception access rule*** with ***pre-established criteria*** (FIG. 2, Col. 3, Lines 58-65 and 15-27, Col. 4, Lines 11-13).

Kraenzel further discloses objects are stored in the database and can be searched by at least one field (Col. 2, Lines 54-56). A series of inferencing rules is used to determine user's affinity by user affinity determining object (Col. 3, Lines 61-62 and 15-27), then profile system 14 enable the user to activate one or more inferencing rules as desired (Col. 4, Lines 11-13). As seen, an inferencing rule as ***an exception access rule including pre-established criteria*** in user affinity determining object is ***retrieved from the*** database as ***centralized database*** by searching.

After updating ACL, the access is ***automatically approved based on the*** inferencing rules or ***exception access rule*** (FIG. 3, boxes 156-158, Col. 4, Lines 25-27).

Kraenzel does not explicitly teach ***pre-determined rules are established*** in addition with methodology as discussed above, and ***the evaluation based on pre-determined rules.***

Behera teaches a method to control access via properties system by providing ACL rules based on the properties associated with the entries (Behera, Col. 1, line 64-Col. 2, line 5). Behera further discloses the step of ***establishing pre-determined rules*** (Behera, Col. 4, Lines 25-54) and ***evaluating the pre-determined rules*** to grant access to a user (Behera, Col. 6, Lines 13-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel method by applying the access

rules to the ACL as taught by Behera in order to grant access to a user or a group to a particular attribute object in the database.

Regarding claim 3, Kraenzel and Behera, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating data profiles based on at least one of Data Elements, Data Tags, Rules of Access, an Approver's Name for Each Rule of Access, Rules of Exclusion, an Exception List, and Field Tags*** (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-26).

Regarding claim 4, Kraenzel and Behera, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Behera further discloses the step of ***establishing pre-determined rules in the centralized database based on at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines; and establishing methodology to ensure timely and accurate decision making based on criteria established by the management*** (Behera, Col. 4, lines 26-55).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879], CERN [Administrative Information Services, Oracle HR] and Lillibridge [USP 6,195,698 B1].

Regarding claim 2, Kraenzel and Behera, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, but fails to disclose the step of ***creating an electronic profile based on information available from at least one an OHR Application and an RFCA Application***. CERN teaches an OHR application and Lillibridge teaches an RFCA Application (Lillibridge, Col. 8, lines 35-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Behera method by using information from OHR Application and RFCA Application to build the electronic profile in order to distribute object to a user or a group via IP address.

Claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039].

Regarding to claim 5, Kraenzel teaches ***a method for managing a user profile*** (Kraenzel, Abstract) ***using a web-based system that includes a server system coupled to a centralized interactive database and at least one client system*** (Col. 1, Lines 13-26, ACL is a centralized interactive database coupled with server/client system). The Kraenzel method comprises the steps of:

providing capabilities for a user to request access to information that the user currently does not have access to (As shown in FIG. 3, after making an object request access at box 152 and if user privilege does not meet minimum requirement for object requested at box 156, additional privilege can be requested and processed by boxes 162-168. Boxes

162-168 as ***capabilities for a user to request access to information that the user currently does not have access to***);

tracking a status of the request using a tracking component coupled to the centralized interactive database (as illustrated at Kraenzel FIG. 3, after making a request access at box 152, ***a status of the request***, either YES for retrieving object at box 158 or NO for requesting additional privileges at box 162, Col. 4, Lines 20-35, ***is tracked by*** Access Determining Object 24,Col. 3, Lines 5-7, as ***a tracking component*** included in Profile System 14. Access Determining Object 24 is ***coupled to*** an ACL as ***centralized interactive database***, Col. 2, Lines 14-16);

obtaining a decision from an owner of the data requested (additional privilege is determined by system administrator to have YES/NO branch, Col. 4, Lines 37-39);

If the request for data access is approved at box 166, ACL is updated at box 168 (FIG. 3). The update process is illustrated at Col. 3, Line 58-Col. 4, Lines 1 with inferencing rules or and a profile for the user. In short, the ACL update process performs the claimed ***if the request for data access is approved, adding at least one of a rule and the user to the database***;

notifying the user of the decision (NO decision is notified to the user at box 164, FIG. 3).

Referring back to Kraenzel FIG. 3, user privilege is determined again at box 156, ***if the user is denied access*** indicating by NO branch of box 156, box 162 determines if the user has requested for additional privileges, a YES and NO requests ***prompting the user to complete the request for*** additional privileges as ***quick approval*** is implied at this box. Instead

of granting access as indicated at boxes 152-156, ***an internal exception access process*** is implemented at boxed 162-166 ***for*** additional privileges as ***quick approval*** that is approved based on pre-established criteria, e.g., read-only, manager... as illustrate at Col. 3, Lines 9-11.

Additional privileges, e.g., read-only, manager... is determined at box 166, and if privileges are granted, ACL is updated at box 168 (Col. 3, Lines 10-11, Col. 4, Lines 20-43). As shown in FIG. 2 is the process of updating ACL. User privileges are determined at box 108, and user's affinity is determined at box 110 by ***applying*** inferencing rules or ***exception access rule*** with ***pre-established criteria*** (FIG. 2, Col. 3, Lines 58-65 and 15-27, Col. 4, Lines 11-13).

Kraenzel further discloses objects are stored in the database and can be searched by at least one field (Col. 2, Lines 54-56). A series of inferencing rules is used to determine user's affinity by user affinity determining object (Col. 3, Lines 61-62 and 15-27), then profile system 14 enable the user to activate one or more inferencing rules as desired (Col. 4, Lines 11-13). As seen, an inferencing rule as ***an exception access rule including pre-established criteria*** in user affinity determining object is ***retrieved from the*** database as ***centralized database*** by searching.

After updating ACL, the access is ***automatically approved based on the*** inferencing rules or ***exception access rule*** (FIG. 3, boxes 156-158, Col. 4, Lines 25-27).

Kraenzel does not explicitly teach the step of ***managing access control to applications and data by implementing a level of security across the different applications that is the same for each application*** as in the preamble.

However, as disclosed by Kraenzel, ACL is used for generating or updating a profile (Col. 3, Lines 3-4). ACL also is used to control access to objects, e.g., files, documents... (Col. 2, Lines 12-15) with different level such as read-only, manager... (Col. 3, Lines 4-12). As seen, ***a level of security***, e.g., read-only, manager..., is ***implemented across different applications is the same for each applications***, e.g., generating, updating a profile, object accessing, by using ACL, and obviously, ***is the same for each applications*** because only one ACL is used, and the purpose of privileges, e.g., read-only, manager..., is to ***manage access control to application*** such as generating, updating a profile, object accessing.

Regarding claim 6, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***obtaining at least one of an approval decision and a disapproval decision*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 7, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***reviewing and auditing the user access*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 8, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating a consistent security model that includes centralized administration of security of the system and uses single user profile and privilege for accessing different applications*** (Col. 3, lines 1-15; Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 9, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating user profiles; providing access control to data associated with user profiles; defining permissions based on a user identifier associated with user profiles; and developing a specification for user interfaces*** (Kraenzel, Col. 3, line 1-Col. 4, line 13).

Regarding claim 10, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step ***providing administration of a common security model for access control and event notification*** (Kraenzel, FIG. 3).

Regarding claim 11, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***updating profiles automatically on at least one of a pre-determined timed interval and a change in organization hierarchy*** (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42).

Regarding claim 12, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel does not explicitly teach the step of ***updating profiles automatically when a user transfers departments***. However, as disclosed by Kraenzel, profile system 14 may automatically update a user's profile by periodically checking the ACL of the network. This may be performed on a routine basis, or on a random basis, when requested by a system administrator, or at various other instances. System 14

may also use the above process for updating a user profile by simply adding supplemental information to the user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42). Thus, when a user transfers departments, system administrator updates the ACL, and user profile will be updated automatically. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Stockwell method by including the step of updating profiles when a user transfers department in order to control access to a database.

Regarding claim 13, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***generating access list reports that identify accessible and non-accessible data and restrictions for access*** (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 20-26 and Col. 2, lines 12-16).

Regarding claim 14, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***retrieving information from the centralized database in response to a specific inquiry from an administrator*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Stockwell et al. [USP 5,950,195].

Regarding claim 15, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel fails to teach ***the client system and the server system are connected via a network and wherein the network is one of a wide area network, a local area network, an intranet and the Internet***. Stockwell discloses ***the client system and the server system are connected via a network and wherein the network is one of a wide area network, a local area network, an intranet and the Internet*** (Stockwell, Col. 4, lines 21-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel method by including a network in order to process the method for the remote users.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behera [USP 6,535,879] in view of Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039 B1].

Regarding to claim 16, Behera teaches a LDAP as a database configured to be protected from access by using Access Control List or ACL. The Directory Server Administrator creates basic ACL rules that grant specific users access to certain information in the directory (Behera, Col. 3, lines 9-37). Behera further discloses the ACL rules that comprises a group based access guidelines based on the attributes to set up the rule (Behera, Col. 4, lines 42-44) as ***data corresponding to pre-established criteria developed from access rules and criteria including at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines***. As in Behera, Col. 4,

Lines 40-41, in order to allow access to a specific user, user name and access privileges such as read, write are used

ACL: (list of attrs) (allow(read) user= "prasanta")

As seen, a user can retrieve data in the database corresponding to the read applications, the read application is cross-referenced against an access privilege (read) as unique identifiers, and user name as data corresponding user that cross-references user name against "prasanta" as unique identifier. In other words, the technique as discussed indicates ***data corresponding to applications, including system administrator defined attributes that cross-references the applications profile data against unique identifiers; data corresponding to users that includes a user's organization and citizenship that cross-references the users profile data against unique identifiers***. Although the directory server matches the desired attributes within the specified attribute fieldname with the user's attributes for allowing access to the directory entry only if the user has the desired attribute values. Behera fails to teach ***data corresponding to pre-determined rules and methodologies that facilitates accurate user access-decision making***. Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by

the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user. If, however, step 156 determines that the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), step 162 determines whether the user has requested additional privileges from the system administrator. If additional privileges have not been requested, step 164 notifies the user that access has been denied. Otherwise, step 166 determines if additional privileges have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, step 168 updates the ACL and may proceed to retrieve and present the requested object using steps 158 and 160 respectively. If step 166 determines that additional privileges have not been granted, the user may be notified that access has been denied using step 164 (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43). As seen, the procedure for accessing a requested object of FIG. 3 as ***predetermined rules and methodologies that facilitates accurate user access-decision making***. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Behera technique by using the method of access as taught by Kraenzel in order to process an access request of a user.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E. BREENE can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HUNG Q PHAM
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

April 29, 2005

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER